



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/287,707	04/07/1999	YASUJI MIZUTANI	1832/36	6622

7590 12/18/2002

KENYON & KENYON  
1500 K STREET, N.W.  
SUITE 700  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

SICONOLFI, ROBERT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3683

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/287,707

Applicant(s)

MIZUTANI ET AL.

Examiner

Robert A Siconolfi

Art Unit

3683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,21 and 35-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/2/02 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1, 3, 21, 35, 39, and 41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicants have stated that the primary brake force is not necessarily the same as the brake operating force. The examiner can not find support for this distinction in the elected embodiment or the specification. In the elected figure 15, the primary brake force is the brake operating force.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 35-37, 39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lohberg (U. S. Patent no. 4,828,332).

See all figures 1 and 3, brake operating member 2, brake master cylinder 7, brake cylinder 11,12, sensing device (stroke detector 19, wheel speed sensors 20,21), assisting device 3 and 4, control provided by ECU 22

6. Claims 1, 3, 35-37, 39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kellner (U. S. Patent no. 5,531,509).

See all figures 1 and 4, brake operating member 2, brake master cylinder 22, brake cylinder 23,24,25,26, sensing device (pressure sensor 33,34, wheel speed sensors 37,38,39,40), assisting device 1, control provided by ECU 36, high pressure source 19a, reservoir 18, pressure control valve 17

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kellner et al in view of Schramm et al.

Kellner et al is relied upon as above. Kellner et al does not disclose redundant sensors to detect pedal operation. Schramm et al teaches redundant sensors to detect pedal operation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use redundant sensors to detect pedal operation as taught by Schramm et al in the system of Kellner et al in order to provide a more reliable system.

***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed 12/2/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the primary brake force is not the brake operating force. The examiner finds no support in the elected embodiment for this statement. Therefore, assuming the primary brake force is the brake operating force, Lohberg reads on the instant invention. Furthermore, the examiner argues that the force provided by the motor 4 is part of the assisting force, not the primary force (it is part of the assisting system and can supply a positive force as well as a counter force).

Art Unit: 3683

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert A Siconolfi whose telephone number is (703) 305-0580. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9 am-3 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Lavinder can be reached on (703) 308-3421. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Robert A Siconolfi  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3683

RS  
December 13, 2002

*Robert A. Siconolfi 12/13/02*  
**ROBERT A. SICONOLFI**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**